



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"IN THE HOPE OF THE NEW ZION."¹

H. M. KALLEN.

ZIONISM is the contemporary phase of an unyielding loyalty, a practical idealism, which is without parallel in European history for constancy, duration and force. Crossed by all the currents of aspiration and disillusion that were the changing mind of Europe for two thousand years, this loyalty or idealism remained, until recently, distinct in itself, the Jewish aspect, older than its setting, of that hunger for safety and happiness which, in the century before the beginning of the Christian era, gripped the civilization of the Mediterranean in an other-worldly grip, spread in later years to all Europe, and holds it, with all its mutations, to the present day. The hope of a new Zion was coeval with the moral surrender of the Stoic; it antedated the passionate otherworldiness of early Christianity; it confronted, and survived, the religious imperialism of the Church Triumphant; it underwent the impact of the newer protestant order, the challenge and fecundation of science and free thought, of naturalism and secularism, and it has emerged, more essentially continuous with itself, more essentially like what it was in its beginnings than any other aspiration or adventure which the great tradition of Europe knows. Of this tradition the biography of Zionism is an integral part, both soil and substance of its ancient roots, and leaf and branch of its spreading life, seeking the free air and the sun. Its nature is at once that of a vision, and that of an adventure. Of a vision, because it sets forth no in-

¹ The Zionist movement has been one of the most striking of the many vigorous assertions of national aspiration within the past months. It has come as a surprise to many and has not won complete assent among Jews. Is it of interest to Jews only, or has it international significance? At the request of the editor Dr. Kallen has undertaken to interpret Zionism. The present article deals with its past; a second will treat its present meaning and importance.

carnate and existing society, no operating association of men. Of an adventure, because it never lost grips with reality, never was quite cut off from the spot of tangible earth which might be not only sought, but found and touched and loved, in the world of real men and real things. To make this spot of earth once more theirs in fact as it was in spirit, men and women of Jewish blood, generation after generation, during two thousand years abandoned their all and went adventuring toward the Promised Land. Zionism is simply to-day's phase of the unyielding effort of the Jewish people to make good the Promise of the Promised Land.

This Promised Land is no land of Beulah, no kingdom of Heaven in regions supernal. It is a definite piece of the earth's surface, of definite dimensions, bordering on the Mediterranean and lying at the junction of the three great continents of the eastern hemisphere. It has been the battle ground of the civilizations of antiquity. It has been the motherland of the dominant religions of the western world. The names of its mountains and its valleys, of its cities and towns and villages have been woven into the texture of the mind of Europe. For a thousand years its chief city was regarded as the centre of the very universe and all its places as holy places. Yet important as have been the rôle of these and of the land that holds them in the life of mankind, that importance is of small degree beside the rôle of this land in the life and labors of the Jewish people. It is from the latter, in fact, that the former derives. Palestine has been the centre of the Jewish theory of life and the Jews' outlook on the world. Their national tradition is built around it. Entering it, staying in it, being driven from it, returning to it, are the instigating motives of their historic narratives, of their prophetic books, of their psalms, their liturgy, their prayers, their collective endeavor in the community of mankind. No people in history has identified itself in joy and in sorrow, and always in aspiration, so completely with a single land, and a land which the great majority of their generations

have known only in prayer, in idea, in vision, for a thousand years. This identification is itself a universally-accepted commonplace of the great tradition of the western world. The connection between the Jew and Palestine, the connection between Palestine and the Jew is customary, natural, a matter of course even to the least literate of Europeans. So, also, by and large, is the reunion of these two that have been separated.

I.

The original source of these commonplaces of the European mind is of course that body of varied documents, sacred to Jew and Christian alike, the Bible. A secondary, but equally potent source is Christian theology. According to the Biblical narrative, the history of the Jews as a people may be said to begin with the hope of the Promised Land, with the consciousness of a goal to be attained collectively, in return for the assumption of a collective obligation to a supernatural being. This consciousness in the course of time converted a congeries of tribes into a nation, and a nation into a self-conscious aspirant toward that righteousness without which must come disaster. Israel, in a word, is a "chosen people." Between him and Jehovah there is a contract. Israel is to devote himself to the exclusive service and worship of Jehovah: Jehovah, in return, is to lead Israel to the Promised Land, to keep him and to prosper him there. The service and worship of Jehovah and the prosperity and growth of the nation in Zion were functions of one another. How, under the influence of the changes from nomadic to an agricultural order of life, the nature and terms of the contract changed; how, under the propaganda of the prophets, from Amos to Isaiah, ritual in the service of Jehovah was replaced by righteousness; how national security became correlative, in idea at least, with social justice, are commonplaces of all critical histories of the ancient Jews. Already in Amos the prophetic philosophy of history is manifest: Divine Law requires justice and lovingkindness between men and

states; disobedience of this law is followed by disaster, brought, through God's will by one state on another, all states and kings being merely the tools and servants of God. This philosophy is already ripe in the sermons of Jeremiah, but tradition accords supreme excellence to the expression given it by the second Isaiah. Applied to the domestic history and foreign relations of the Jewish state, it interpreted national defeat at the hands of enemies of Israel as the consequence of domestic iniquity, and national survival and national victory as coincident with domestic righteousness. Righteousness became the condition of political and military security. Expulsion from the Promised Land was, hence, the consequence of sin, and return thereto would be the reward of a return to righteousness.

Events subjected this philosophy to a drastic test. That it did not possess a monopoly over the thinkers of Israel may be seen from the theory of life promulgated in the Book of Job, which divorces fortune from morals altogether, but there is in the prophetic theory a certain compensatory dimension, a quality of consolation and justification, which renders it more relevant to the aboriginal hopes of men and Nature's disregard of them. Carried to its logical limit, it must lead the man who has been righteous but unfortunate all his life to the conception of another life and another world, beyond Nature, in which he will be fortunate as well as righteous, and in which the wicked will be unfortunate as well as wicked. This is precisely what Christianity, once extended beyond the bounds of Jewry, did. But the Jews then and there did not go so far. For them, reward and punishment were here and now, where sin and virtue were, and the hope of good fortune for the righteous was a hope for this world and not another. Particularly was this the case for a whole people, a nation, whose span of life out-reaches the brief mortality of the individual. The people of Israel, banished from its land for its unrighteousness, should be restored for its righteousness. This was Jehovah's promise, and in this promise his people might take comfort. The restoration would be bodily, political, physical. It

would install an era of international peace and international comity, the rule of law replacing the rule of force, the life of co-operation, the life of conflict.

And it shall come to pass in the end of days,
That the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established as the top of
the mountains,
And shall be exalted above the hills;
And all nations shall flow unto it.
And many peoples shall go and say:
"Come ye, and let us go up to the mountains of the Lord,
To the house of the God of Jacob;
And he will teach us of His ways
And we will walk in His paths."
For out of Zion shall go forth the law,
And the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.
And He shall judge between the nations
And shall decide for many peoples;
And they shall beat their swords into plowshares
And their spears into pruninghooks;
Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
Neither shall they learn war any more.²

Dithyrambs such as this, of different imagery, but of the same identical spirit and outlook, are scattered throughout all the prophetic books. They are the well-springs of subsequent Jewish speculation about the nature and destiny of the Jewish people, from the primal passions of the prophets, to the sophisticated formulations of modern Jewish theology-mongers. The conception of the "mission" of Israel, which the latter make so much of, springs from them, and the Jewish repudiation of that mission springs equally from them. They underly the Jew's loyalty to his law or *Thorah*, and the invincible optimism with which the mass of the Jewish people have clung to it. "This is the law" says the daily prayer, "which Moses set before the Children of Israel, according to the word of the Lord. To all who cling thereto she is a tree of life, and it is well with those who depend upon her. Her ways are ways of kindness, and all her surrounding is peace." The real

² Isaiah II, 1-5.

and adequate practice of the law, however, the prayer-book also tells us can be achieved only in the Promised Land, nor can it prevail among the nations until the restoration to the Promised Land is accomplished.

This restoration, from the first exile in the seventh century before the beginning of the Christian era through the first millennium after it, is conceived in political terms. The prophets, indeed, are politicians and statesmen concerning themselves with both domestic and foreign problems, and using "the word of the Lord" as authority for their political doctrine and social policy. The "law" which they preached, as we have it in Deuteronomy and Leviticus, is an obvious response to the challenge of the injustices of ancient—and for that matter, of modern—society. The ideal of international peace under a general law for all nations is the outcome of the bitter political experience of a small state situated at the junction point between the competing military imperialisms of Asia and Africa. The prophets were nothing if not *realpolitiker* with a passion for the preservation of Israel for Zion and of Zion for Israel, and they grew to realize that the only device by which this could be secured was an international order and a single law. After the manner of the ancients, they attributed to this law a divine origin and sanction, and described its rule as the rule of God. But the substance of their vision is not other than that of the vision of all internationalists who regard the realities of the relations between nations and states and hope for their improvement. It was evoked by the same recurrent causes: how could it have other than the same essence? Their glory is, that they were the first in all the world to envisage and to utter that essence, but they uttered it, none the less, out of the fervor of their patriotism, and not because they had blurred the living diversities of mankind in an unreal abstraction, labelled "humanity." Prophetic "universalism" did not abolish the nations, it harmonized the nations; and was nationalistic to the point of giving to Israel a dominant note in the international harmony, and to Zion the foremost place. Indeed, when

it was most "universal," it was most actively nationalistic, for the rhythms of deutero-Isaiah, the utterances of Zechariah and of Haggai framed the conspiracy to restore the independence of the Kingdom with Zerubbabel, servant of the Lord, scion of the House of David, for King.³ Behind the conspiracy was an urge to independence and to freedom from the foreign yoke which never subsided so long as there was the semblance of a Jewish government in Palestine. When prophet gave way to priest as the master of the mind of Judea, it was the unconscious cause of the friction between the native and the foreign administrations. It underlay the successive resistances, both spiritual and physical, to Persian and Greek conquerors. It animated the Hasmonean uprising and found itself in the Hasmonean independence, and when the alliance with Rome which was to guard that independence became its ravisher, it took the form of the new schisms within the state; the resistance to Herod, the hope of a champion, of a Messiah like Judas Maccabæus; the rebellion against Titus and the final uprising and brief success of Bar Kochba. Even after the terrible revenge which the imperial government took for that uprising, the will of the Jews for a free Zion remained unbroken. Oppressed and persecuted by emperor after emperor, particularly after Christianity became the imperial religion, they had strength enough to join in the seventh century the invading Persians against the Romans, in the hope of re-establishing their ancient state. That hope was again disappointed. When the country reverted to Byzantium, the monks persuaded the Emperor Heraclius to exterminate the Jews. Those who escaped joined their brethren in Egypt and elsewhere in the mediterranean world, to hope anew.

The most lasting thing these exiles, like all their kind, carried with them was, then, this hope of the restoration to Palestine. It dominated the liturgy and the poetry of the exile; it governed Jewish policy and suffused the Jewish

³ Cf. Zechariah VI, 9-15.

outlook. It underlies the organization of the Jewish communal economy, contributing elements in the practice of the ritual and the observation of the seasons. For a thousand years it continued to be an aspiration of practical political import, re-enforced with religious faith. Wherever a Jewish community was to be found, then as now, the prayer could be heard, "for our sins have we been banished from our country and removed far from our land"; and the invocation for the return to Zion, for the re-establishment of the Davidic throne, for the realization of the prophetic pledge. We cannot, says the prayer, in our banishment serve thee according to thy commandment. "Next year in Jerusalem," is a change rung again and again in the Liturgy both of week days and Sabbath and holydays. It links itself with the political activities of the whole millennium: hardly a century passed in which the Jews of one country or another were not called upon by a self-proclaimed Messiah to gird up their loins and by miracle or militancy win back to Zion. In fifth century Crete, one Moses, assuming miracle, led his people into the sea, where most were drowned. David Alroy, again, in the twelfth century, actually succeeded in developing a military adventure strong enough six hundred years later to rouse the imagination of Beaconsfield, who made a novel about him. The expectancy of a political restoration, under the leadership of an earthly Messiah, was a commonplace in the mood of Europe. It is sharply evinced in the tenth-century letter of Chasdai ibn Shaprut to the King of the Chazars, a Jew by conversion; and it is literally accepted by non-Jewish Europe. For to the Christian mind, no less than the Jewish, Palestine is the Jewish land and the Jews are the Palestinian people, foreign to Europe, absent from their own land, and in the fulness of time to be returned to it. The equity of the Jew in Palestine has remained a strand in the great tradition of the Christian world. The return of this chosen people to this Promised Land was regarded by multitudes as an essential preliminary to the second coming of the Saviour, and the fulfilment of the forecasts of Chris-

tian eschatology. To Christians of the first millennium this return was more deeply implicated in a system of supernaturalism than to the Jews, but however implicated, it was expected.

The development and final enthronement of a similar supernaturalism among the Jews was accomplished in the twelfth century. The position of the Jews in European countries grew steadily worse. Disability and persecution were multiplied, and the temper of the Crusades brought them to a climax. Under the circumstances, the notion of a naturalistic, though divinely predetermined, restoration which should be salvation from horror and evil, could not withstand the assault of misfortune. That restoration must come, the Jews of the world became more and more convinced: how else could Israel escape alive out of the inferno which the Church Militant had made for them of their lives? But that it could come out of their own strength, a natural eventuality of the process of history, was no longer conceivable. They were too weak, too battered, impotent against their persecutors. Only the might of a miracle could save them and restore them. And as the figure and mode of their salvation had already been established in tradition and legend as Messiah the son of David, this Messiah acquired a more and more supernatural character. Already in the beginnings of the Messianic legend there had been a potential differentiation between an earthly and a heavenly Messiah. The failure of the earthly Messiahship of the leader of the little sect that later developed into the Christian multitude led to the immediate compensation of the other-worldly ideal which is the Messiahship of the Christian; salvation from evil and happiness became heavenly things: earth was regarded as a trial and a transition, to be abandoned and spurned. The Messiah was God and the Son of God, miserable on earth but omnipotent in the universe. This ideal denial of real failure the Jews had refused to accept. They fought and hoped on for twelve hundred years. And when, finally, misfortune, and the infection of their intellectual and emotional setting made

otherworldliness a part of their outlook, it did not become the overruling part. The Messiah became a supernatural figure indeed, pre-existing, and destined to conquer the enemy and persecutor and restore Israel by means of miracle, but, the end achieved was still to be a natural and historic end continuous with the rest of the movement of history, even if the means were to be discontinuous and supernatural. From the twelfth century on the self-proclaimed Messiahs are more and more miracle-workers, philosophasters, men of a psychopathic strain. Their moral and intellectual settings are misery, magic, and mysticism, the two latter being the complement of, and escape from, the former. For the same reason the puerilities of the Kabbala became constitutional to their outlook and Kabbalism itself a dominant influence on the mind and fortunes of Jewry. But the misery and the compensatory supernaturalism reached their height in the seventeenth century. Their symbol was the false or pseudo-Messiah, Sabbattai Zevi of Smyrna. Only that he was a charlatan, weak and without integrity, not that he was a false Messiah must be regarded a reproach to him. All Messiahs are false when they fail, for the success of works, not faith, is the only proof of true Messiahship, and how is the success of works to be achieved by the means and attributes of the Messiahs of thaumaturgy? The importance of Sabbattai Zevi was due to the European character of his influence. Not only Jews fell under it. It touched statecraft and affected the policies of the world. It is the ironic and picturesque expiration of a period in the history of the European struggle for democracy.

II.

1648 is a momentous year in the history of Europe. It is the year of the Peace of Westphalia and of the formation of the Puritan Commonwealth in England. It marks the end of over a hundred years of warfare and the final overthrow of a political principle which had dominated Europe to its hurt since the Council of Nicæa, in the 325th year of

the Christian era. This was so built into the social system of the Christian world that much of the history of this world might be described as a narrative of the methods hit upon or chosen to evade or oppose it. The principle might be designated, briefly, as the principle of religious imperialism. It was a new thing when it was promulgated. The ancient and pagan world knew nothing about it. It came to Europe as a logical implication of the Christian philosophy of life, and the status and fate of the Jews were closely bound up with it. Although the religions of the states of antiquity, Athens, or Sparta, or Corinth, or Judea, or Rome, were state religions, they did not imply intolerance toward the gods of other states, particularly when those states were not at war. Between these gods and their worshippers there was held to be a certain community, looking back to a community of blood, which gave the gods a prerogative and monopoly on the reverence and worship of the citizens, and the citizens a claim to priority on the good will and protection of the gods. All gods, as we see most conspicuously in the case of Jehovah, had certain tribal, civic, national, predilections and obligations, even when most universal and all-embracing in their divinities. They remained to a great degree chthonic, with larger powers and jurisdiction over special places, and very specific centres of worship and residence. The men of the ancient world expressed this divine economy by paying due reverence to the gods of the lands in which they travelled or sojourned. Even military conquerors, like Alexander, in a day so late as his, worshipped at the shrines of the divinities whose lands they had devastated and implored them for favor and co-operation. Later and more sophisticated times retained this sense of chthonic over-lordship, and the Romans made it a practice to remove the religious holies from the lands of their conquest to appropriate sanctuaries in Rome. The protective power of the divinities, it was supposed, would then accrue to the state of their domicile. Thus pagan Rome was not only tolerant of, but hospitable to, the diversity of religions, and of the

nationalities of which those were among the distinguishing marks. The growth of the Empire, in fact, exercised in this regard a liberalizing influence, in that it necessitated a very large degree of differentiation between citizenship and cult. Because of the tribal background of the small city-states and of their tradition of blood-brotherhood and common ancestry, an alien could rarely become a citizen, even in Athens, the freest of them: he could only be a righteous stranger, as the Bible has it, a sojourner, entitled to justice, but not to participation in the intimacies of the state's life. The empire founded by Alexander, which had a sharply conscious missionary character, continued this tradition. Although it imposed Greek forms of political and social organization and Greek habits of life and thought upon the mediterranean world, it did not establish a common citizenship which should be detached from the local society wherein the privileges of citizenship had to be predominantly exercised. This was an achievement of Roman imperialism.

Roman imperialism, preoccupied from the outset with maintaining the Roman hegemony, the *pax Romana* of the Roman legions and the Roman law, left local customs and practices intact, indeed subsidized and encouraged them. Nationalities and cults flourished and had heyday in the Empire, so long as they were considered not to be dangerous to the state. Until the advent of Christianity there were no religious persecutions in Rome. There were police and military action against political criminals, who practiced or were supposed to practice a doctrine subversive of loyalty to the state. Otherwise, freedom of thought, of belief and cult were, as in some places in recent times, untrammelled. Had they not been, Christianity never could have made headway against its rivals. When, for reasons of his own, Constantine made Christianity the religion of the state, the Empire was thrown back to the position of the city-state which it had outgrown, and worse. This deteriorative reversion was inevitable from the assumptions of Christianity itself. For these assumptions the Judaism of

the priests, as distinguished from the Hebraism of the prophets, has its own responsibility. So long as men admit that alternatives are possible to any theories or doctrines they may entertain, the qualities of intolerance and the arrogances of infallibility cannot develop. Experience remains the court of last resort in the judgment of truth. Truth remains a thing not primary but eventual, and this eventuality in the knowledge of what is true and what is false among alternatives, keeps them more or less equal, and bars intolerance. This was the case with the congeries of national divinities of most of the city-states of the ancient world. With hieratic Judaism there came, however, a difference. It assumed the sole and exclusive acquisition and possession of the truth, as revelation. Everything else, consequently, no matter what it was, nor how nor where it came from, had to be regarded as error. Truth being given finally and completely, its possessor was infallible, and debate, experiment, the whole intellectual enterprise, the scientific attitude of mind, became malice and perversity. Difference becomes either concealed agreement or blasphemous defence of error. For people to whom Holy Scripture was the sum and substance of all wisdom, the philosophers and scientists must needs be either its interpreters or its enemies, and were so held.

When the Christian sectaries made of the script which was the revealed word of God their own holy, adding thereto the New Testament, they also made their own the assumption of infallibility of hieratic Judaism. The adoption of Christianity as the state religion gave them the force wherewith to make this assumption effective. Citizenship became conditional on conformity to certain artificial standards of right doctrine, those opinions which failed to conform being *ex hypothesi* false, and the judges of the failure being the ruling class to whom the guardianship of the standards had accrued. The Jews were, by the implications of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, non-conformists, and hence without title to citizenship. Imperial edict deprived them of it in the year 339, and the bulk

of them have remained thus deprived to the present day. In the course of time all infidels, non-conformists, dissenters, heretics, became automatically outlaws, and a large portion of the history of European civilization is the history of an attempt on the one side, to crush them out, by fire and sword, on the other side to compel their acquiescence by force or persuasion. No doubt other motives than the religious were involved; no doubt the latter was often used as an excuse for other types of greed and aggression, but until the Reformation and after, it remained the foremost in the consciousness of Europe.

To the consciousness of Europe the world was basically an Augustinian Epic. Eternal and Omnipotent God, it held, had created in six days' time a perfect world. This perfection would never have lapsed if Adam had not disobeyed the command of Eternal and Omnipotent God. His disobedience brought death into the world and all our woe. It caused his banishment from Paradise. The sin, original with him, became a hereditary constitutional and outstanding element in the nature of all his offspring. All, together with the world God made for them, were deserving of, and under God's justice were predestined to, eternal destruction, had God's mercy not prevailed against God's justice and provided atonement. At various times, hence, he manifested himself to a selected portion of the sons of Man, to the seed of Abraham, namely. To these he delivered his law, with the view of an eventual atonement for Adam's original sin, and the redemption of man from the penalty of it. Hence the incarnation and the crucifixion. These are the atonement, vicarious of course, but none the less the salvation of those predestined to believe. Such, predestinate from the beginning of time, are the citizens of the City of God, of the Church catholic, universal. All others are citizens of the City of the World. The Jews, particularly belong to this latter city. They had been God's first chosen. To them he had revealed himself, with them had made his covenant, to them had sent as Messiah his only-begotten son, who was only another form of himself,

for the redemption of sin-cursed mankind. And they had rejected the Messiah and had had him nailed to the cross. For this God rejected them in their turn, and cursed them to live under the ban of his rejection, outcast from the community of the saved, plying forbidden vocations in disaster and dispersion until the second coming of the Messiah of Lord, and the restoration at his hands.

This eschatology, furthermore, was inextricably interwoven with the social system of the feudal order, a system that has its maximum ideal expression in the bull *Unam Sanctam*. It is a thing of logic tempered by rebellion, resting consciously in metaphysics as few social systems have. Its basis is the omnipotence of God, without whose sustaining grace nothing can be or come to be. But this sustaining grace is not regarded as being distributed equally and impartially among all the children of God. Existence is a hierarchy and its parts are related as the links of a pendent chain. Each hangs from the other, without which it would fall into the abyss. Since the greatest strain is on the highest link, in that must be concentrated the greatest power, and as there is no strain to speak of on the lowest link, least power is needed or belongs in that. The highest link, directly pendent on God, is the Pope, his vicegerent on earth, the visible symbol and concretion of the church universal. In him, consequently, must be the maximum concentration of the grace of God. From him it passes downward and outward, to the princes of the church and the temporal power, like light decreasing in intensity with its distance from the source, so that when it finally reaches the peasant serf there is enough left for the sacraments of baptism, confirmation, marriage and burial, but nothing else. Everybody in society depends on somebody higher up, and woe to the man who has no overlord to depend upon. He is a "masterless man," without status or right, the prey of any power strong enough to seize him.

The enforcement of this social system, save in the case of the serfs and the Jews, was never complete. The temporal struggled against the arrogations of the ecclesiastical power,

emperor against pope, kings against emperors, noblemen of lesser rank against kings, cities against dynasts, and on occasion even the peasants rose. The great majority of these conflicts were, however, conflicts within a framework of unanimity. The hand of every man was against the infidel, the heretic, the dissenter, the non-conformist. The inquisition was as impartial as the temporal power was debauched. Religious imperialism was stronger than political imperialism and for a long time succeeded in maintaining by force as truly catholic a unanimity as, human nature being what it is, was humanly possible. One dissentient sect after another arose and went down before this force, from the Arians, Lollards, Hussites, to the Huguenots. The Jews alone, in the heart of Europe, underwent without resistance a religious war waged against them by the whole of Europe, and survived it. They were the everlasting Protestants. But the conscience of Europe was not freed until the mutual interplay and rivalry of religious and dynastic interests brought about that military confrontation in religious terms which we know as the wars of the reformation. Those wars, quite as much a conflict of dynasties for empire as of doctrines for domination, and carried on almost continuously for nearly a century and a half, finally destroyed the imperialism of religion in Europe. They left the continent a desert, the feudal order shattered, the local sovereign an autocrat, and the peasantry almost destroyed. But particularly they left the mind of Europe free from the central fixation to which religious imperialism had compelled it, and both the misery and enterprise of Europe free for intellectual adventure. The destruction of the imperialism of the church converted it into the opportunist foe of the temporal power, and its theorists, like the Jesuit brothers Mariana and Suarez, opposed the people to the kings and superimposed the church on both. Protestantism itself, again, by setting the authority of the Bible against that of the Pope and abolishing intermediaries between God and the hearts of men, struck at all authority, political as well as ecclesiastical. The idea of the natural rights of man was

used to confront the tradition of the divine rights of kings. Political doctrine took imaginative wings. The challenge to sovereignty was made effective in England by the genuine execution of a king. In the rest of Europe it became a potential menace, working in the background of men's thoughts, and bursting now and then into foreground in action.

But if men found themselves in real ideas of this type, they sought also to escape from the misery to which they were a response in a new lease of supernaturalism and a new magic. The substitution of the Bible for the church as the seat of authority in religion aroused interest, intellectual but by no means kindly, in the People of the Book and all their works. The Kabbala had almost immediately seized the wandering imagination of Europe. Its mysteries, letters, phrases and calculations, its pretensions to magical powers, allied as they were with hidden meanings attributed to the Bible, fascinated the imagination of Europeans, from Pico della Mirandola, to the latest English Biblistaster mulling in mysteries. This, together with the complete emotional and intellectual decentralization, could not but lead to anticipations of the Messiah. The time of the restoration of Israel to Palestine and of the second advent was held to be at hand. Kabbalistic calculations among Jews put it in 1648. And Christian millenarians put it in 1666.

Between 1648 and 1666—the era of Sabbattai Zevi's "mission"—came, however, one of the very darkest pages of the history of the Jewish people. Their status in Europe derived from two assumptions, both implicit in their alienation from citizenship in 339. The first was that they were members of a foreign nation, living in their own communities, under their own laws, and governed by their own hereditary or elective rulers. The stress thrown by theology on the absence of the Jews from Zion, the designation of their absence as a *Galuth* or dispersion, has obscured the truly national character of the Jewish community, national both in the political and the cultural sense. Men forget that absence from Palestine meant presence some-

where else, and it happens that there has been hardly a period in the history of the Jewish people without the concentration of the greater part of them in a single continuous area, into a community organized and operating under Jewish law. That it was not sovereign, in the sense of being a war-making, peace-making community; that it was a subject-nationality, largely at the mercy of its neighbors; that it was hence a repressed community without freedom for its spontaneous energies, are matters of record. Nevertheless, it was a political entity, self-determined and with almost complete internal autonomy, and was until the nineteenth century dealt with as such by the masters of Europe and Asia. Such an entity was the Exilarchate of the House of David, which came into being with the Babylonian Captivity; such was the Nagidate in Egypt; such was the *Wa'ad Arbah Arazoth* (*Council of the Four Lands*) or *Congressus Judaicus* in Poland. The latter country, extending at the time when this Congress flourished almost from the Baltic to the Black Sea, was the great area of concentration for the Jewish people of Europe from the thirteenth century on. These Jewish governments acted for the Jewish people in all matters affecting their relations with their landlords, conquerors or overlords.

The *Congressus Judaicus*, indeed, was an echo of the Polish *saym* resting on a foundation of congregational units and achieving what was for the time a very high degree of democracy. It was responsible to the Polish kings both for the domestic and the foreign affairs of the Jews, particularly for taxes. It was the one agency that stood between the Jewry of Poland and the total destruction that menaced it with the Chmelnicki uprising in 1648. The Messianic afflatus of the period was largely a function of this uprising. An act of revolt and resentment on the part of the Ukrainian *khlops* or peasantry against the unbearable exactions of their Polish overlords, it struck hardest at the Jews. The Jews had been agents of these overlords, tax-farmers, factors and such, and they were the first to pay. Chmelnicki organized a Jew-hunt that ranged from

Podolia and Volhynia to Lithuania and White Russia. He was followed by the real Russians, who had declared war upon the Poles. The Russians were followed by the plague. In the course of little more than a decade the Jewish people had lost 675,000 of their number, their homes were devastated, their property destroyed. Thousands fled to western Europe, other thousands sought safety in baptism. Without the help of the Jewry of western Europe, which came swiftly and generously, the *Congressus Judaicus* of Poland could never have reconstituted the economy of their nation. But the great comfort of their misery was the word out of the East of the imminence of the Messiah and the return to the Promised Land. They believed,—how, so miserable, could they help believing?—and their belief sustained them.

Religious doctrine had its own part in their misery. It was the second and other ground of their disability, a more terrible ground, for the position of the Jew in the European religious system, no matter what the sect, was regarded as determined by divine revelation and was a commonplace of faith that was taught to the poorest serf. The Jew was held to be eternally excommunicate from the gates of the common salvation, rejector of it, and cursed for the rejection. His existence, hence, could be maintained only on sufferance. Being beyond communion, he was without rights, civil or personal. The church might order his destruction, overruling even the will of the king, whose property according to the mediæval custom, the Jew automatically was. The church authorities in Poland were indefatigable in their efforts against the Jews and their faith. They drove them from the public service, assaulted the general principles of their charter, demanded and compelled sumptuary laws against them, both of dress and domicile, spread against them blood libels and levied on them illegal and extortionate taxes. The Reformation gave the church in Poland, as elsewhere, an added animus. Jewish influence was credited with causing the heresy, and any punishment short of death was not too great. "The

Church," declared the Ecclesiastical Synod of 1542, "tolerates the Jews for the sole purpose of reminding us of the torments of the Saviour." Between 1648 and 1666 the Catholicism of Poland finished off the uncompleted depredations of Chmelnicki and his Haidamacks and of the Muscovite and his troops. The misery of the Polish Jews reached a depth so ultimate that their minds could not conceive of a salvation less so. The new Messiah was believed in with a fervor measurable only by the tragedy from which he was to save his people. The Jews of Ukrainia, writes the Christian, Galatovski, who flourished at the period, abandoned their all in readiness to be carried on a cloud to Jerusalem.

In sum then, between 1648 and 1666 the political, intellectual, and emotional condition of the whole European world was such that the achievement of the restoration of the chosen people to their Promised Land was generally accepted as the imminent precursor to a millennial change. The anticipation moved all classes of society equally, from the miserable and expropriated peasantry and Jewry, seeking in magic salvation from fact, to the most intellectual and scientific protagonists of that new adjustment of cosmic outlook which we call science. It is used by Mennaseh ben Israel in his successful attempt to persuade Cromwell to remove the ban against the settlement of Jews in England. "The opinion," he writes, "of many Christians and mine do concur therein that we both believe that the restoring time of our Nation into their native country is very near at hand." It is the subject of exchange between the Gentile scholar Oldenberg and the Jewish philosopher Spinoza. "All the world here," Oldenberg writes to Spinoza, "is talking of a rumour of the return of the Israelites . . . to their own country. . . . Should the news be confirmed, it may bring about a revolution in all things." And Spinoza, many years later, when the Sabbattian craze was already subsident, arguing in the Theologico-Political Tractate for the equality of all peoples before God, insists that whatever election the Jews were beneficiaries of was

national and social, that it "had no regard to aught but dominion and physical advantages, for by such alone could one nation be distinguished from another." "Nay, I would go so far as to believe that if the foundations of their religion have not emasculated their minds they may even, if the occasion offers, so changeable are human affairs, raise up their empire afresh and that God may a second time elect them."

The significant thing about the whole Sabbattian adventure and the development that led up to it is the fact that nowhere in Europe was there any question that the Jews are a nation, that Palestine is "their own country," that the two belong together. Nor has there been any question in the European mind since.

III.

For Europe the Messianic expectancy was only a passing mood. Science, begun as an adventure, became an institution; its temper of interrogation and challenge forced everything under analytical scrutiny, from the least-regarded spontaneities of nature, to the most sacrosanct taboos of man. The eighteenth century incorporated into its common sense what had been daring imagination in the seventeenth, and its calm and satirical eye discerned underneath all the differences of race, faith, color, wealth, power, station, nurture and capacity, a "natural man" the equal and the peer of his fellows. Inequalities, it declared, were the artificial effects of the institutions of civilization; the effects of the state and the church, which, again, were the perversions of nature by the few in their immemorial exploitation of the many. One God, one law, one human nature are at the foundation of all life. Each man is the equal of every other man; each is equally and inalienably entitled with all others to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"; each has contracted the insurance of his title by consenting to the creation of government; each has been then defrauded by the government he has created of just that natural right which he had designed it to protect.

Strip away government, the church, the economic order, and you abolish crime and poverty and the whole hierarchy of social inequalities. All these are man-made. They do not exist in nature, and they should not be tolerated by enlightened men. By nature men are citizens of the world, not of the state; followers of natural religion, not of this or that fabrication of priests; like lovers of one another, not haters seduced thereto by artificial diversities. They are equal and alike by nature; different only by nurture.

This teaching, common to England and to France, particularly to France, was not, of course, the pure deduction of science. It was quite as much, and perhaps more, resentment against the concentrated absolutism which had become characteristic of the state-system of Europe in the eighteenth century. In England alone had this failed to fix itself firmly, and the period from the restoration of the Stuarts to their final expulsion and the formulation of the Bill of Rights was a period of actual conflict between a dynastic absolutism grounding itself on the traditional divine rights of kings, and a democratic nationalism grounding itself on the scientific natural rights of man, with a final practical victory for natural rights. On the continent, the victory was entirely dynastic. States were conceived as estates—"l'état, c'est moi," was no paradox of a paranoiac king—and populations and territories changed hands in marriage and warfare conducted as the purely private and self-sufficient enterprises of royal privilege. Everything was property, including opinion. Thus, religious imperialism had not given way to tolerance. It merely had been replaced by religious nationalism. Citizenship remained an appurtenance of conformity to certain standard dogmas and beliefs. This, as Locke's essays on toleration attest, was as true in England as on the continent; and the winning of toleration was itself a political event compelled mostly by the political strength of the disabled religious minorities. Toleration is in substance religious democracy. Whatever may be the situation *de jure*, it is impossible without at least a *de facto*

distinction between church and state, a distinction that becomes possible only when sects are so numerous and varied that the alternative to toleration is civil war. Over the major part of the continent of Europe religious nationalism prevailed to within the third year of the present war, and citizenship and church-membership were coimplicative and coincident. The greater the strength of this artificial coimplication, the more centralized and absolute the government which sustains it, the more complete, the more logical and systematic the theoretical repudiation which according to time, place and circumstances it undergoes. Such was the case in France. The theorizing of the Encyclopædists, from Diderot and Voltaire to Montesquieu and Rousseau, carried to their logical limit the practical assumptions of Locke and the other authors of the English Bill of Rights. They made good in idea the shortcomings of the social facts.

That their logic should ultimately be extended to the Jews was inevitable. In England this extension had been proceeding in the normally piecemeal and muddling British way. Although it was not absolutely completed until 1890, it was begun practically with their readmission to England in Cromwell's day, and progressed in the usual English parliamentary fashion from then on. In France, the extension was shorter, sharper, more purely theoretical. First made in formal terms by Montesquieu, it received practical application and defence at the hands of Mirabeau and the Abbé Grégoire. During the revolution the two latter fought for it in the National Assembly against the clericals, and it was finally carried (1791) as an inevitable corollary of the constitution. The effect was formally to convert the Jews from a nationality into a sect: "Judaism," wrote Deputy Schwendt to his constituents in Alsace, "is nothing more than the name of a distinct religion." The Jews were enfranchised, not in their collectivity, as a corporate entity, a nationality, but individually, Jew by Jew, each as a "natural man," the equal of all other "natural men," without heredity, history, language,

culture or social memory, a mere "now" in the temporal extent of the generations. The stripping of his selfhood which this required was of course an impossible price to pay for enfranchisement. It was suicide, and a nationality can only die or be killed but cannot commit suicide. Nevertheless the Jews of western Europe fancied that they could pay the price and survive as Jews. They accepted the responsibility of the affirmative to Napoleon's questions of 1806. Without this affirmative he would have withdrawn from them the civil freedom which the Revolution had won for them. Their yielding it initiated, so far as social history is concerned, the mental attitude and development of what is called the Reform movement in Judaism.

In this movement there is nothing primarily religious. It began with no great inspiration, no great vision and gospel of inner regeneration, which are the traits of genuinely religious reforms. Its beginnings rest in a political and social position, and to this day it has not advanced from this position. It stands still on the intellectual platform of the eighteenth century and the French Revolution, on the doctrine of natural rights and natural law and the rule of abstract reason. It strips from the Jew all that makes him a concrete human being, all his reality. It denies in its very form the existence of the social personality called the Jewish people. It substitutes for the vision of the Messiah, which sustained the Jews in the middle ages, the conception of "the mission of Israel," to justify such minimal differences as the organizers of Reform could not bring themselves to abandon. It restates, with an inverted valuation, the mediæval conception of the status and function of the Jewish people. Where, for example, Christianity declares that the Jews had been condemned by God to dispersion because of their rejection of the Saviour, the Reform Jews say, "The dispersion is a fact, but is not due to the curse of God, but to the realization of the divine purpose to bless the world." Where Christianity says, "Jews are dispersed and will continue as a living witness to the prophecies of the

Bible which proclaims their dispersion," the Reformers assert that this dispersion is predestined so that the Jewish sectaries who have been chosen by the Lord, may be everlasting witnesses to the truth of the Bible and its prophecies. And where Christianity declares that this dispersion will last until the second coming of Christ, until the appearance of Christ as the Paraclete, the Reform sect declares that this dispersion is to continue until all men shall acknowledge the "Jewish God." In this way the movement has attempted automatically, under the rule that ideals are compensatory for facts, to convert what to Christians is the shame of the Jewish people into a merit. It did that, I think, on the whole, if I read the literature aright, with something like a broken heart. It wanted for the Jewish people the same values that other peoples in the world were getting. There is no question about the nobility of the intentions of Reform, and there is no question about the magnificent distinction of one phase of Reform achievement, not noticed by Reformers. This is the liberation of the Jewish woman, and if nothing else justifies it, that does. But once it has liberated the Jewish woman, it has done its whole work. The intention of Reform was excellent, but the method used, being contrary to the trend of social history, failed to achieve the results intended.

Other states slowly imitated France. Western Europe completed the enfranchisement of the Jews, severally, only toward the end of the nineteenth century. And this enfranchisement, of course, has the defects of its virtues, for Western Jewry took, with respect to the enfranchisement it sought, a position which was an acknowledgment that Jewish qualities, Jewish forms of life and thought were in Jews unworthy; that Jewish differences from their neighbors were, on the whole, inferiorities, and that Jews must become—except that they call their priests "rabbis" and worship in "temples" and not in churches—the same as the Gentiles. The Reform movement, therefore, has been what is called an assimilationist movement. That is, it has wanted for Jews not an equal but a similar happiness to

that of all other peoples. And what it has accomplished in order to get this life and happiness has been to rob the enfranchised Jew of the self-respect of his birthright as Jew; has been to compel him to act on the assumption that the whole substance of the Jewish background and tradition, the organization of Jewish life with its implications, is a worthless thing, a thing to be abandoned.

This whole process rests on the illusion that equality is similarity. It is concomitant with the uncritical doctrine of natural right and natural law; with the resentment which this doctrine expressed against the artificial inequalities of the dynastic and ecclesiastical systems that robbed men of their due of freedom and happiness. The doctrine is compensatory, a protest, not a description. But in animating and guiding the French Revolution it served a high purpose. It enfranchised the peoples of Europe, even in the course of the Napoleonic attempt to enslave them. It awakened their dormant corporate consciousness. It led them to realize their nationality and to struggle for its freedom. To say this is to say that people "were becoming conscious, in trying to respond to the call of the Revolution, of what nature and habit and hope they and their neighbors were, and of how these were expressed in language and tradition, in memory and custom, in all that makes a community's cycle of life. The revolutionary call to Equality meant, for the daily life, the abolition of all caste and property distinctions. . . . The Revolution's call to Fraternity meant for the daily life, comradeship on an equal basis with anyone with whom communication could be effectively held—in truth with the neighbor near at hand, who speaks the same language and has the same background, who, by virtue of this sameness, *understands*. The revolution's call to Liberty meant, first and foremost, the overthrow of the traditional oppressor at home and the achievement there of self-government, the replacing of dynasty by commonwealth.

"Had the new French nation continued to treat the peoples its armies set free as peers, as fellow-citizens, not as subjects; had Napoleon not once more restored piratical

imperialism to the place from which the ideas of the Revolution had driven it, the ruling caste of Europe could never have succeeded in duping their subjects into believing in the identity of their interests and the community of their cause. Even so, their success depended on a concession to the principle that sovereignty rests in the people. For the call to resist Napoleon had to be made through an appeal to self-appreciation, through a propaganda, sometimes inspired, sometimes spontaneous, exhorting the various peoples of Europe to consider the excellence and dignity of their ancestries, their cults, their traditions, their histories, their ways of living, their arts, and particularly their languages. The most conspicuous continental instance of such a propaganda is the series of 'Addresses to the German People,' by the philosopher Fichte."

But there were many others. It is part of the irony of the of the Jewish position that those Jews who were in contact with the great movements of the day, scions of the one people that had from antiquity on been champions of nationality against all imperialism and tyranny, should seek themselves to repress and destroy their own at a time when it was awaking to renewed life over the whole continent of Europe—in Greece and among the other victims of Turkish domination; in Germany; in Poland; in Ireland. That the restoration of Palestine to the Jewish people and the Jewish people to Palestine had even in this period touched the interests and hopes of Jews and Gentiles both, there is much in the record to show. An anonymous letter to the Jews of France, by "one of them," proposed in 1798 the creation by the Jews of the world of a Jewish council which should treat with the French government for the restoration of Palestine to its traditional people. "The country we propose to occupy" he wrote,⁴ "shall include (subject to such arrangements as shall be agreeable to France) Lower Egypt, with the addition of a district, which shall have for its limits a line running from Acre to the Dead Sea, and from the south point of that lake to the Red Sea." He

⁴ Cited by A. M. Hyamson in "Palestine," p. 165.

pointed out the economic advantages of the position, situated at the juncture of three continents, and concluded "Oh my brethren! What sacrifices ought we not to make to attain this object! We shall return to our country, we shall live under our own laws, we shall behold those sacred places which our ancestors rendered illustrious with their courage and their virtues. I already see you all animated with a holy zeal. Israelites! The term of your misfortunes is at hand. The opportunity is favorable. Take care that you do not allow it to escape." Just how the opportunity was favorable is not known, but it is significant that the *Moniteur Universelle* of 1799, 23 *Germinal*, records a proclamation ordered in Constantinople by Napoleon, inviting the Jews of Asia and Africa to enroll under his banners for the purpose of re-establishing ancient Jerusalem. The failure of both the Western and Eastern Jewries to respond to these calls had probably no slight connection with the Napoleonic impatience and severity in 1806, when the Emperor practically compelled by his questions the Jews of his domains either to repudiate their nationality or to put themselves in a position to affirm it by force. The council of notables or Sanhedrin which he called repudiated it: the bulk of them came not from the free heart of France but from clericalist and priest-ridden Alsace. The writer of the letter of 1798 came from a freer-hearted and clearer-visioned time in the history of France.

Significantly, the one great parallel of this period issues a generation later from the world's other great seat of freedom and republicanism, the United States of America. It is there overlaid a little with elements of mountebankery and melodrama, and takes some time to come clear. But clear it does come finally, and its terms are remarkably similar to those of the letter of 1798. Its terms are promulgated by Mordecai Manuel Noah. Its first shape in his mind was that of a Messianic adventure tempered by the business of real estate speculation. Sensitive to the sufferings and disabilities of his people, he conceived the notion of founding for them on Grand Island, not far from Buffalo, a city of refuge, which he designed to call Ararat, and to establish

himself as Chief Judge of Israel. He persuaded a Gentile friend to invest in the land, and in September, 1825, proceeded amid much comic circumstance and public comment to lay the corner-stone of his city in an episcopal church in the village of Buffalo. On the occasion he issued a proclamation, appointing commissioners, levying taxes, ordering a census and so on, and reviving and re-establishing the ancient "government of the Jewish Nation, under the auspices and protection of the constitution and laws of the United States of America."⁵ The enterprise was, of course, damned from the outset by its charlatanic character. At its core nevertheless was good sense and sound statesmanship. The idea persisted in Noah's mind, but it turned from a city of refuge on the North American continent to a complete restoration in Zion. To this he reverted repeatedly, always with the notion that the United States might act as the liberator. "The United States," he wrote in 1844, "the only country which has given civil and religious rights to the Jews equal with all other sects; the only country which has not persecuted them, has been selected and pointedly distinguished in prophecy as *the nation*, which, at a proper time, shall present to the Lord His chosen and down-trodden people, and pave the way for the restoration to Zion." This could be done simply by the guarantee of protection in the purchase and holding of land in Palestine. The idea met with the approval of John Adams, President of the United States, 1797-1801. "I really wish" he wrote Noah, "the Jews again in Judæa, an independent nation, for, as I believe, the most enlightened men of it have participated in the amelioration of the philosophy of the age; once restored to an independent government, and no longer persecuted, they would wear away some of their asperities."

"I wish your nation may be admitted to all the privileges of citizens in every part of the world. This country (America) has done much: I wish it may do more, and annul every narrow idea in religion, government and commerce.

H. M. KALLEN.

BOSTON, MASS.

⁵ Cf., "Mordecai M. Noah," by A. B. Makover.